**FILED** 

## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

MAR 16 2006

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JORJIK TSADOURIAN,

Petitioner,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 04-75846

Agency No. A78-759-544

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted March 8, 2006\*\*

Before: CANBY, BEEZER, and KOZINSKI, Circuit Judges.

Jorjik Tsadourian, a native and citizen of Armenia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order summarily affirming an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, and may reverse only if the evidence compels a contrary conclusion. *Chebchoub v. INS*, 257 F.3d 1038, 1042 (9th Cir. 2001). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's adverse credibility determination because the IJ identified numerous inconsistencies in Tsadourian's testimony, and between his testimony and asylum application, that went to the heart of his claim regarding his identity, his political affiliation, and the treatment he suffered at the hands of members of the Yerkrabah. *See de Leon-Barrios v. INS*, 116 F.3d 391, 394 (9th Cir. 1997) (where discrepancies that are central to the claim are present and no satisfactory explanation has been provided, an adverse credibility finding is supported by the record). In the absence of credible testimony, Tsadourian failed to establish eligibility for asylum, withholding of removal, or CAT relief. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156-57 (9th Cir. 2003).

## PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.